Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview & Summary Information

Date Investment First Submitted: 2009-06-30
Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-06-26
Investment Auto Submission Date: 2012-02-29
Date of Last Investment Detail Update: 2012-02-24
Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update: 2012-08-21
Date of Last Revision: 2012-08-21

Agency: 024 - Department of Homeland Security **Bureau:** 58 - Customs and Border Protection

Investment Part Code: 01

Investment Category: 00 - Agency Investments

1. Name of this Investment: CBP - Land Border Integration (LBI)

2. Unique Investment Identifier (UII): 024-000005116

Section B: Investment Detail

1. **Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

Under LBI, CBP is capitalizing on the success of WHTI by reusing the capabilities developed for inbound vehicles in other mission areas: pedestrian inbound, vehicle outbound, and Border Patrol checkpoints. CBP is further leveraging these capabilities by integrating systems and sharing data across these missions. This integrated approach and expanded scope is reflected in the program name change from WHTI to Land Border Integration (LBI). The original Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI) investment allowed CBP to effectively address the requirements imposed by Section 7209 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (IRTPA), Public Law 108-458), as amended, by the deadline of June 1, 2009. The WHTI investment made modifications to inbound vehicle primary processing lanes at U.S. land border ports of entry. LBI is leveraging WHTI developed RFID technologies, upgraded license plate readers (LPRs), and a greatly improved primary inspection application. These capabilities were originally deployed under WHTI to ensure that inbound primary processing time would not increase as a result of the new WHTI documentary requirements (which could cause significant border crossing delays). Instead, the promotion of RFID technology and new RFID document options resulted in more efficient processing methods (20% - 60% faster than standard processing without RFID). The improved LPRs have reduced manual plate corrections by 10 million per year further reducing process time and improving security. The investment enhanced border security by reducing

the number of acceptable documents that can be presented from thousands to a relative handful. This reduced number of acceptable documents makes it easier for officers to identify fraudulent documents due to increased familiarity with the documents. LBI extends the benefit by ensuring that the vehicle and/or document data can be acquired not only on inbound, but on outbound and at Border Patrol checkpoints. CBP officers, Border Patrol agents, and the traveling public all benefit from the improvements introduced by LBI to land border crossings and checkpoints.

2. **How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.**

WHTI, addressed the key capability gaps for providing advanced information, streamlining documentation requirements, assembling comprehensive travel histories and enhanced intelligence and targeting rules. CBP lacks these capabilities in other environments (pedestrian, outbound, checkpoint) and therefore lacks an integrated view of vehicles and people as they enter and leave the country. CBP is extending the WHTI capabilities to other mission areas. The Key Pedestrian Gaps are; no advanced traveler information; ineffective directional signage; insufficient tactical control (manual port absconder deterrent); travelers with and without compliant travel documents intermingled, creating an inefficient processing environment; limited biometric capability, resulting in extended processing times. If unfunded, security gaps will continue; port absconders will continue to put officers' lives at risk; and processing will remain labor intensive, and long waits will continue at the largest pedestrian crossings. Key Outbound Gaps – unlike inbound operations, most POEs do not have adequate infrastructure or technology to conduct effective outbound operations and intelligence gathering. Outbound operations lack the basic tools inbound uses (LPR, RFID, VPC) to properly inspect vehicles and travelers. Existing LPR technology is old, and does not contribute significantly to intelligence gathering. Without funding, millions in cash and weapons will continue to cross the land border into Mexico, fueling the drug war, border violence, and the emerging violence on U.S. soil. Failure to fund will continue to put American lives (officers and citizens) in danger. Key Checkpoint Gaps – BP checkpoints lack the basic information and technologies provided in the inbound vehicle environment: LPR, RFID, and VPC. These technologies would provide and correlate license plate information and passenger document information to the Border Patrol Agent. In a limited one week test at a very small checkpoint – two arrests were made solely due to the mobile (handheld) LPR and document read capabilities – and the handheld is the least robust capability envisioned by CBP in the outbound environment. Without funding, BP agents will have little to no intelligence by which to conduct checkpoint inspections and protect the U.S. interior. Failure to fund precludes CBP from providing needed vehicle and traveler intelligence to advance its targeting abilities.

3. **Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.**

WHTI Implemented the LBI Triangle Strategy (integration of information between inbound, outbound and OBP Checkpoint processing) including: deployed WHTI inbound technical solution on 10 lanes at 4 locations; began deployment of re-engineered pedestrian processing on 3 lanes at 1 location; piloted a Tier 3 outbound solution; began southwest border

deployment of 1 Tier 1 outbound solution, 5 Tier 2 outbound solutions, and 36 Tier 3 outbound solutions. Deployed integrated LPR capability to 1 fixed and 14 tactical OBP checkpoints on the southwest border. Deployed the following lane optimizations to improve lane discipline and speed up processing of inbound traffic. Lane Flow Optimization involving the placement of descriptive signage within individual lanes and a paint scheme which reduces visual clutter and emphasizes locations within each lane. Ready Lanes for travelers with RFID-enabled travel documents at 12 locations.

4. **Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).**

Planned CY (FY2012) accomplishments include: - Pilot of pedestrian re-engineering deployment begun in FY 2011 (unfunded) - Begin upgrading Tier 3 outbound deployments to Tier 2 (24 locations) or Tier 1 (14 locations) – (unfunded) - Deployment of an additional 10 to 20 Border Patrol Checkpoints (unfunded) - Implement Ready Lanes, Variable Message Signage, and Lane Flow Optimization to additional crossings (funded) Planned BY (FY2013) accomplishments include: - Complete upgrading of Tier 3 outbound deployments begun in FY 2012 (unfunded) - Implement Ready Lanes, Variable Message Signage, and Lane Flow Optimization to additional crossings (funded) - Implement technology refresh of inbound technical solution deployed during FY2008 (unfunded).

5. **Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.**

2007-07-31

Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding

	PY-1 & Prior	PY 2011	CY 2012	BY 2013
Planning Costs:	$3.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	$311.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	$32.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	$346.3	0	0	0
O & M Costs:	$139.9	$74.2	$74.8	$74.8
O & M Govt. FTEs:	$68.0	$1.6	$1.7	$1.7
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	$207.9	$75.8	$76.5	$76.5
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	$554.2	$75.8	$76.5	$76.5
Total Govt. FTE costs:	$100.1	$1.6	$1.7	$1.7
# of FTE rep by costs:	588	10	10	10
Total change from prior year final President's Budget ($)		$0.0	$-3.7	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		0.00%	-5.00%	

2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:

For FY 2013 in Table 1 there is a reduction from the FY 2012 President’s Budget. The difference reflects a reduction in the number of FTEs supported by the investment from 294 to 10. While 294 FTEs were acquired by the investment, beginning in FY 2011 responsibility for support of these FTEs was transferred to agency base S&E.

Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value ($M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
Awarded	7014	HSBP1010F00311	HSBP1010A00058	7014							
Awarded	7014	HSBP1007F14334	GS35F4880H	4730							
Awarded	7014	HSBP1011C00060									
Awarded	7014	HSBP1008J19873	HSHQDC06D00023	7001							
Awarded	7014	HSBP1011C00068									
Awarded	7014	HSBP1010J00108	HSHQDC06D00023	7001							
Awarded	7014	HSBP1010J00730	HSHQDC06D00023	7001							

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:
EVM was performed on the FFP prime contract during DME. Since FFP does not provide for a cost variance, schedule variance becomes the primary EVM indicator

Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

Section A: General Information

Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-06-26

Section B: Project Execution Data

Table II.B.1 Projects

Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost ($M)
2	LBI Phase 1	Initial operating capabilities for pedestrian, outbound, and checkpoint. This project includes the piloting of a re-engineered pedestrian process on 3 lanes at 1 pedestrian location (Paso Del Norte, TX). In the outbound environment, Phase 1 will deploy one Tier 1 (robust, inbound-like) solution; five Tier 2 (fixed LPR+) solutions; and 36 Tier 3 (mobile capability) solutions. Phase 1 also delivers LPR and VPC capabilities to Border Patrol checkpoints: a fixed solution at one checkpoint and tactical solutions and 14 checkpoints. Finally, Phase 1 will deploy WHTI inbound technical solution to 10 remaining lanes at 4 locations.			

Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project	End Point Schedule	End Point Schedule	Cost Variance	Cost Variance	Total Planned Cost	Count of

Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities ($M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance ($M)	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost ($M)	Count of Activities
		Activities ($M)	Variance (in days)	Variance (%)	($M)	(%)	($M)	Activities
2	LBI Phase 1							

Key Deliverables

Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days)	Schedule Variance (%)
2	Tier 1 / 2 IOC	Implement 1 outbound Tier 1 solution (Anzalduas) and 4 outbound Tier 2 solutions	2011-10-31	2011-11-18	2011-11-18	77	-18	-23.38%
2	BP Tactical IOC	Implement19 BP tactical solutions	2011-10-31	2011-11-11	2011-11-11	77	-11	-14.29%
2	Ped Gate IOC	Implement new gating system with document readers and enhanced US-PED at Paso Del Norte	2011-11-30	2011-11-30	2011-11-08	152	22	14.47%

Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
Percentage of arriving land border travelers with WHTI-compliant documents.	Percent	Mission and Business Results - Services for Citizens	Over target	90.000000	93.000000	96.000000	95.000000	Monthly
RFID document saturation	Percent	Customer Results - Service Coverage	Over target	20.000000	25.000000	33.000000	30.000000	Monthly
Average POV inspection time (seconds)	Number	Process and Activities - Cycle Time and Timeliness	Under target	52.000000	52.000000	48.500000	52.000000	Monthly
VPC availability	Percent	Technology - Reliability and Availability	Over target	99.000000	99.000000	99.200000	99.000000	Monthly
End-to-end query response time (seconds)	Number	Technology - Efficiency	Under target	5.000000	5.000000	1.400000	5.000000	Monthly